

REMARKS

This Amendment is prepared in response to the Office action mailed on 24 July 2008 (Paper No. 20080717). Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3-13 and 21-23 will be pending. Applicant has canceled claims 2 and 14-20 without prejudice or disclaimer as to their subject matter, amended claims 1, 6 and 10 and newly added claims 21-23 by this amendment.

Elections/Restrictions

On page 2 of Paper No. 20080717, the Examiner has made the restriction requirement of Paper No. 20080325 final and has withdrawn method claims 14-17 from consideration. For the purpose of expediency, Applicant has canceled withdrawn claims 14-17 and their depending claims 18-20 by this amendment.

Prior Art Rejections

On page 3 of Paper No. 20080717, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-13, and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Nozawa *et al.* (JP 2003-15548), cited in Applicant's IDS of 18 October 2008. Applicant has the following comments.

Regarding Applicant's claim 2, Applicant claims in claim 2 "the power supply line being formed on a layer different from the gate line and the data line". On Page 3 of Paper No. 20080717, the Examiner addressed this limitation by saying, "In re claim 2, Nozawa et

al shows that the power supply line 32 being formed on a layer different from the gate line 33 and the data line 31 (Figure 1)". Applicant disagrees.

To begin with, FIG. 1 of Nozawa is a **top view** of the device, not a sectional view (see paragraph 0049 of Nozawa). As a result, Applicant submits that it is impossible to determine from the top view of FIG. 1 whether or not line 32 is formed on a same or different layer from lines 33 and 31. Being a top view, FIG. 1 of Nozawa does not show relief, and thus it is impossible to determine from FIG. 1 whether or not line 32 is on a same or different layer than lines 31 and 33. As a result, Applicant submits that Nozawa fails to disclose a power supply line being on a different layer than the gate and data lines as claimed by Applicant.

Secondly, FIGS. 2 and 6 of Nozawa **are sectional views** of the structure of FIG. 1 of Nozawa, and each of FIGS. 2 and 6 of Nozawa positively show each of lines 32 and 31 both being on a same layer 57. Because FIGS. 2 and 6 of Nozawa show lines 32 and 31 both being formed on a same layer, Nozawa actually teaches away from Applicant's claim 2.

Thirdly, paragraph 0054 of Nozawa describes a process of making the structure of FIGS. 1-6. The process is to form the unit blocks 39, place the unit blocks 39 onto a glass substrate 52, then form the signal wire 31, power source wire 32, scanning line 33 and capacity line 38 on the resultant structure, and then deposit ITO electrode 19. From this description of paragraph 0054 of Nozawa, it seems plausible and likely that some of 19, 31,

32, 33 and 38 are arranged on a same layer. Because of this, Applicant submits that Nozawa fails to teach or suggest line 32 being formed on a different layer than 31 and 33 as asserted by the Examiner in Paper No. 20080717. As a result, Applicant has amended claim 1 to substantially include the subject matter of claim 2 by this amendment since the prior art rejection of claim 2 in Paper No. 20080717 is clearly without merit¹.

Regarding Applicant's claim 11, Applicant claims, "the power supply layer being formed in a grid shape in which corresponding ones of said plurality of pixel electrodes being disposed in each grid". On Page 5 of Paper No. 20080717, the Examiner addresses this limitation by saying, "In re claim 11, Nozawa et al teaches that the power supply layer 32 being formed in a grid shape in which corresponding ones of said plurality of pixel electrodes 19 being disposed on each grid (Figure 1)". Applicant disagrees.

Applicant has reviewed FIG. 1 of Nozawa and submits that power lines 32 are not in a grid shape but are instead extending only in one direction, up and down and not also across as in Applicant's FIG. 3A. Because FIG. 1 of Nozawa shows lines 32 extending only in one direction and not in both directions as in Applicant's FIG. 3A, it can not be said that Nozawa discloses a grid-shaped power supply layer as claimed by Applicant. As a result, Applicant submits that the prior art rejection of Applicant's claim 11 in Paper No. 20080717 is without

¹Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of former claim 2, but has also changed "gate line *and* data line" to --gate line or data line-- to cover the possibility that the gate line and the data line could be arranged on different layers.

merit.

On Pages 6 and 7 of Paper No. 20080717, the Examiner rejected claims 4-5, 8-9 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Nozawa JP'548 in view of Koyama (US 2003/0117083). Applicant has the following comments.

Regarding Applicant's claim 4, Applicant claims, "the power supply line and pixel electrode being formed of a material having both a low resistivity and a high reflectivity". On Page 7 of Paper No. 20080717, the Examiner admits that Nozawa fails to teach this feature, but then states FIG. 4 of Koyama and its accompanying text says that electrode 49 can be made out of gold which has low resistivity and is highly reflective. Applicant disagrees.

Applicant has reviewed Koyama and submits that reference numeral 49 of Koyama is not a power supply line as claimed by Applicant. Applicant submits that reference numeral 49 of Koyama is merely an electrode for a pixel and is not a line or a power supply line as claimed by Applicant. Furthermore, it is the essence of Applicant's invention to provide a structure that has a power supply line without a voltage drop along the line (see Applicant's paragraphs 0006, 0012, 0017, 0044 and 0051). Neither Nozawa nor Koyama teach or fairly suggest this. Because Koyama fails to teach that a power supply line is made out of a material having a low resistivity and a high reflectivity, Applicant submits that the

prior art rejection of Applicant's claim 4 in Paper No. 20080717 is without merit

Comments on Claim Amendments and Newly Added Claims

Applicant has amended each of claims 1, 6 and 10 to claim that the power supply line or power supply layer is arranged on a different layer than the gate line or the data line. Applicant submits that the applied prior art of Paper No. 20080717 fails to disclose, teach or suggest this for the reasons given above in Applicant's traversal of the rejection of claim 2.


Applicant has newly added claims 21-23 by this amendment to claim that the power supply line or power supply layer is of a grid shape as in Applicant's FIG. 3A. Applicant submits that the applied prior art of Paper No. 20080717 fails to disclose, teach or suggest this for the reasons given above in Applicant's traversal of the rejection of claim 11.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are patentable over the cited references, taken either alone or combination and accordingly should now be in a conditions suitable for allowance.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,


Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56937
Date: 10/23/08
I.D.: REB/ML